

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Su

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
12/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Von Arx	279.366US1	5052
590 09/10/2004		EXAM	INER
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938		MANUEL, GEORGE C	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		3762	
	12/19/2001 590 09/10/2004 AN, LUNDBERG, WO 8	12/19/2001 Jeffrey A. Von Arx 590 09/10/2004 AN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. 8	12/19/2001 Jeffrey A. Von Arx 279.366US1 590 09/10/2004 EXAM AN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. 8 IS, MN 55402 ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/025,223	VON ARX ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	George Manuel	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuly and the period for reply will be set or extended period for reply will, by statuly and the period for reply will be set or extended period for reply	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr te, cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		•			
	—· is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	<u>·</u>				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	•			
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	•			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Burea	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applic Ority documents have been rece au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	a of the certified copies not rece	veu.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ∭ Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		al Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 28, 31, 36-40, 42-46 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 41-46 of copending Application No. 10/025, 183. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed toward obvious variations of powering a far field receiver according to a duty cycle.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Pursuant to MPEP 804, the double patenting rejection is <u>not</u> withdrawn because the double patenting rejection is not the only rejection remaining in the application.

Art Unit: 3762

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35.

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 39-42, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Mass et al '045.

Mass et al disclose a dipole antenna suitable for radiating and receiving far-field electromagnetic radiation formed by respective halves of a device housing 101a and 101b.

The examiner is interpreting the transmit/receive switch 333 to allow the controller 302 to operate at either a first or a second duty cycle depending on the control signal sent and received by the implantable device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3762

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barreras '397 in view of Mass et al '045.

Barreras shows a near-field communications link comprising inductor receiver coil 30 and a far-field receiver comprising antenna 11. Barreras fails to teach transmitting an acknowledgment signal upon receiving a wireless command.

Mass et al teach implantable devices include the capability for bidirectional communication so that information can be transmitted to the programmer from the implanted device. Among the data which may typically be telemetered from an implantable device are various operating parameters and physiological data.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to transmit an acknowledgment signal based on an implantable device receiving an operating command because the programmer needs to know the operating parameters have been programmed into the implantable device. The teaching of Mass et al

Art Unit: 3762

is applicable to the Barreras device because the teaching applies to far-field communications for implantable devices.

Regarding claims 33 and 35, the examiner is interpreting a second duty cycle to comprise the ratio of "on" time for the far-field receiver based on the signal received to the "total" time.

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 6/24/04 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3762

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (703) 308-2118.

George Manuel Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3762

9/2/04